arXiv:1611.09906v1 [cs.PL] 29 Nov 2016

Revisiting the Futamura Projections: A Visual Tutorial

Brandon M. Williams and **Saverio Perugini**
Department of Computer Science
University of Dayton
300 College Park
Dayton, Ohio 45469–2160 USA
Tel: +001 (937) 229–4079, Fax: +001 (937) 229–2193
E-mail: BrandonWilliamsCS@gmail.com, saverio@udayton.edu
WWW: http://academic.udayton.edu/SaverioPerugini

December 1, 2016

Abstract

Partial evaluation, while powerful, is not widely studied or used by the pragmatic programmer. To address this, we revisit the Futamura Projections from a visual perspective by introducing a diagramming scheme that helps the reader navigate the complexity and abstract nature of the Futamura Projections while emphasizing their recurring patterns. We anticipate that this approach will improve the accessibility of the Futamura Projections to a general computing audience.

Keywords: compilation, compiler generation, Futamura Projections, interpretation, partial evaluation, program transformation.

1 Introduction

The *Futamura Projections* are a series of program signatures reported by [Fut99] (a reprinting of [Fut71]) designed to create a program that generates compilers. This is accomplished by repeated applications of a *partial evaluator* that iteratively abstract away aspects of the program execution process. A partial evaluator transforms a program given any subset of its input to produce a version of the program that has been specialized to that input. We use the symbol `mix` from [Jon96] to denote the partial evaluation operation because partial evaluation involves a `mix`ture of interpretation and code generation. In this tutorial, we will provide an overview of typical program processing and explain the Futamura Projections.

Table 1: Legend of symbols and terms used in § 2 and § 3.

Symbol	Description
program	A miscellaneous program.
p_n	A parameter.
a_n	An argument.
`pow`	A `pow`er program.
$compiler_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{T}}$	A compiler from language $\mathcal{S}$ to language $\mathcal{T}$, implemented in $\mathcal{T}$.
$program_{\mathcal{S}}$	A miscellaneous program implemented in language $\mathcal{S}$.
$program_{\mathcal{T}}$	A miscellaneous program implemented in language $\mathcal{T}$.
$\texttt{compiler}_{\texttt{x86}}^{\texttt{C}\to\texttt{x86}}$	A compiler from C to `x86`, implemented in `x86`.
`pow.c`	A `pow`er program implemented in C.
$\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}$	A `pow`er program implemented in `x86`.
$interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}$	An interpreter for language $\mathcal{S}$ implemented in language $\mathcal{T}$.
$\texttt{interpreter}_{\texttt{x86}}^{\texttt{C}}$	An interpreter for C implemented in `x86`.
$partial\ input_{static}$	A subset of input for a program being specialized by *mix*.
$program'_{\mathcal{T}}$	A specialized program implemented in language $\mathcal{T}$.
$\texttt{square}_{\texttt{x86}}$	A square program implemented in `x86`.
$mix_{\mathcal{T}}$	A partial evaluator implemented in language $\mathcal{T}$.
$\texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}$	A partial evaluator implemented in language `x86`.
$compiler\ generator_{\mathcal{T}}$	A compiler generator implemented in language $\mathcal{T}$.
$\texttt{compiler generator}_{\texttt{x86}}$	A compiler generator implemented in `x86`.

We use the terms *static* and *dynamic* throughout this paper in reference to a variety of bindings. For purposes of this paper, a *static* binding is one that happens before run-time, usually at compile-time, and remains unchangeable during run-time. A *dynamic* binding happens at run-time and is changeable at run-time. For instance, the value of an `int`eger variable is dynamic in that it bound at run-time and can be modified at run-time. The size of an `int`eger variable, on the other hand, is static in that it is fixed (e.g., four bytes) before run-time (usually at language implementation time) and cannot change at run-time. Table 1 is a legend mapping terms and symbols used in this article to their description.

2 Programs Processing Other Programs

Program execution can be represented equationally as $[\![program]\!][a_1, a_2, ..., a_n] = [output]$. Alternatively, the diagram in Fig. 1a depicts a program as a machine that takes a collection of input boxes and produces an output box. We use this diagram syntax to aid in the presentation of complex relationships between programs, inputs, and programs treated as inputs (i.e., data). Each input area corresponds to part of a C-function-style signature that names and positions the inputs. The input is presented in gray to distinguish it from the program and its input bar. Fig. 1b shows this pattern applied to a program that takes a base `b` and an exponent `e` and raises the base to the power of the exponent. In this case, `3` raised to the power of `2` produces `9`, or $[\![\texttt{pow}]\!][3, 2] = [9]$.



(a) Program execution depicted as a machine.



(b) Program execution instance.

Figure 1: Program execution.

2.1 Compilation

Programs written in high-level programming languages such as C must be either compiled to a natively runnable language (e.g., the `x86` machine language) or evaluated by an interpreter. A compiler is simply a program that translates a program from its source language to a target language. This process is described equationally as $[\![compiler_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{T}}]\!][program_{\mathcal{S}}] = [program_{\mathcal{T}}]$, or diagrammatically in Fig. 2a. For clarity, the implementation language appears as a subscript of any program name. Compilers will also have a superscript with an arrow from the source (input) language to the target (output) language. If language $\mathcal{T}$ is natively executable, both the depicted compiler and its output program are natively executable. If `pow` from Fig. 1b is written in C, it can be compiled to the `x86` machine language with a compiler as depicted in Fig. 2b or expressed equationally as $[\![\texttt{compiler}_{\texttt{x86}}^{\texttt{C}\to\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{pow.c}] = [\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}]$. Figs. 2c and 2d illustrate that the source and the target programs are semantically equivalent.

2.2 Interpretation

The gap between a high-level source language and a natively executable target language can also be bridged with the use of an interpreter. "The interpreter for a computer language is just another program" implemented in the target language that evaluates the program given the program's input and producing its output [FW08]. The interpretation pattern, described equationally as



(a) The compilation process.



(b) Compilation example.



(c) Comparison of compiler input and output.



(d) Comparison of compiler example input and output.

Figure 2: Execution through compilation.



(a) The interpretation process.



(b) Instance of program interpretation.

Figure 3: Execution by interpretation.

$[\![interpreter^{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][program_{\mathcal{S}}, input] = [output]$, is depicted in Fig. 3a. The interpreter has the previously established implementation language subscript, with a superscript indicating the interpreted language. The input program's input bar extends into the next input slot, which serves to indicate which input is associated with which of its own input slots. However, as the inputs are still being provided directly to the interpreter, an encompassing box is drawn around each individual input to the program being executed. By convention, the background shading is alternated to differentiate inputs, while the borders of inputs remain gray. This pattern is applied to the `pow.c` program in Fig. 3b; the C program is being executed by an interpreter implemented in `x86` to produce the output from `pow.c` given its input. This interpretation is represented equationally as $[\![\texttt{interpreter}^{\texttt{C}}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{pow.c}, \texttt{3}, \texttt{2}] = [\texttt{9}]$.

2.3 Partial Evaluation

With typical program execution, all input must be provided during execution. Partial evaluation allows for a combination of static partial input, provided initially to `mix` itself, and various different sets of dynamic input, which complete the original program's input, that are later given to the transformed program. For reasons explained below, the Futamura Projections require that `mix` be implemented in the same language as the programs it takes as input; diagrams including `mix` will provide a subscript that represents the implementation language as well as the language of input and output programs.

Partial evaluation is described equationally as $[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][program_{\mathcal{T}}, partial\ input_{static}] = [program'_{\mathcal{T}}]$ and depicted in Fig. 4a.



(a) The partial evaluation process.



(b) Partial evaluation output.



(c) Instance of partial evaluation.



(d) Output of partial evaluation instance.

Figure 4: Partial evaluation.

Here, a program is being passed to `mix` with a (partial) static assignment of inputs, or a subset of its input (in this case, consisting only of its second argument). The result is a transformed version of the program specialized to the input; the input has been propagated into the program to produce a new program. Notice how the shape of the output program mirrors the shape of the input program combined with the static input. Notice also in Fig. 4b that the shape of the program combined with the remainder of its input mirrors the shape of the typical program execution shown in Fig. 1a. However, the input has been visually fused to the program, represented by the dotted line. In addition, the labels for the original program, the second input slot, and the static input have been shaded gray; while the resulting program is entirely comprised of these two components, its input interface has been modified to exclude them. In other words, while the components are still present, they are only in the background of the new program. The equational representation of this resulting program shows the simplicity of its behavior: $[\![program'_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][a_1, a_3, ..., a_n] = [output]$.

The partial evaluation pattern is applied to the $\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}$ program in Fig. 4c. If $\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}$ is partially evaluated with static exponent $\texttt{e}=\texttt{2}$, the result is a power program that can only raise a base to the power 2. This example is represented equationally as $[\![\texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}, \texttt{e}=\texttt{2}] = [\texttt{square}_{\texttt{x86}}]$. The specialization produces a program that takes a single input (as in Fig. 4d and $[\![\texttt{square}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{3}] = [\texttt{9}]$) and squares it. It behaves as a squaring program despite being comprised of a power program and an input; `mix` has propagated the input into the original program to produce a specialized program.

3 The Futamura Projections

3.1 First Futamura Projection: Compilation

Partial evaluation is beneficial given a program that will be executed repeatedly with some of its input constant, resulting in a significant speedup. For example, if squaring many values, a specialized squaring program prevents the need for repeated exponent $\texttt{e} = \texttt{2}$ arguments. Program interpretation is another case that benefits from partial evaluation; after all, the interpreter is a program and the source program is a subset of its input. Fig. 5a illustrates that when given $program_{\mathcal{S}}$ and an interpreter for $\mathcal{S}$ implemented in language $\mathcal{T}$, we can partially evaluate the interpreter with the source program as static input (i.e., $[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][interpreter^{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}}, program_{\mathcal{S}}] = [program_{\mathcal{T}}]$). This is the *First Futamura Projection*. As with the previous pattern, the partially evaluated program (i.e., the interpreter) has been specialized to the partial input (i.e., the source program), which is indicated visually by the fusion of the source program to the interpreter. Notice that $program_{\mathcal{S}}$ is vertically aligned with the static input slot of the partial evaluator as well as the program input slot of the interpreter. This is because $program_{\mathcal{S}}$ serves both roles. In this case, the dynamic input of the interpreter is the entirety of the input for $program_{\mathcal{S}}$. When



(a) The First Futamura Projection.



(b) An instance of the First Futamura Projection.



(c) The output of the First Futamura Projection.



(d) The output of the First Futamura Projection instance.

Figure 5: The First Futamura Projection and example instance.

that input is provided in Fig. 5c, the specialized program completes the interpretation of $program_{\mathcal{S}}$, producing the output for $program_{\mathcal{S}}$. *In other words, the specialized program behaves exactly the same as* $program_{\mathcal{S}}$*, but is implemented in* $\mathcal{T}$ *rather than* $\mathcal{S}$. The partial evaluator has effectively *compiled* the program from $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{T}$. Thus, the equational form is identical to that of a compiled program: $[\![program_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][a_1, a_2, ..., a_n] = [output]$. Fig. 5b and equation $[\![\texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{interpreter}^{\texttt{C}}_{\texttt{x86}}, \texttt{pow.c}] = [\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}]$ express the partial evaluation of a C interpreter when given `pow` as partial input. The resulting program, detailed in Fig. 5d, behaves the same as `pow.c`, but is implemented in `x86`. The equational expression for the target program is also identical to the compiled program: $[\![\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][3, 2] = [9]$.

> **First Futamura Projection**: A partial evaluator, with an interpreter as input, can compile from the interpreted language to the implementation language of `mix`.

3.2 Second Futamura Projection: Compiler Generation

The First Futamura Projection relies on the nature of interpretation requiring two types of input: a program that may be executed multiple times, and input for that program that may vary between executions. As it turns out, the use of `mix` as a compiler exhibits a similar signature: the interpreter is specialized multiple times with different source programs. This allows us to partially evaluate the process of compiling with a partial evaluator. This is the *Second Futamura Projection*, represented equationally as $[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][mix_{\mathcal{T}}, interpreter^{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}}] = [compiler^{\mathcal{S}\rightarrow\mathcal{T}}_{\mathcal{T}}]$ and depicted in Fig. 6a. In this partial-partial evaluation pattern, an instance of `mix` is being provided as the program input to another instance of `mix`, to which an interpreter is provided as static input. Just as in earlier partial evaluation patterns, the program input has been specialized to the given static input; in this case, an instance of `mix` is being specialized to the interpreter. The vertical alignment of programs helps clarify the roles of each program present: the interpreter is the partial input given to the executing instance of `mix` as well as the program input given to the specialized instance of `mix`. Additionally, *this specialized output program as executed in Fig. 6b matches the shape and behavior of the First Futamura Projection shown in Fig. 5a.* This is because the same program is being executed with the same input; the only difference is that the output of the second projection is a single program that has been specialized to the interpreter rather than a separate `mix` instance that requires the interpreter to be provided as input. In the Second Futamura Projection, `mix` has generated the `mix`-based compiler from the first projection. Because the result is a compiler, its equational expression is that of a compiler: $[\![compiler^{\mathcal{S}\rightarrow\mathcal{T}}_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][program_{\mathcal{S}}] = [program_{\mathcal{T}}]$.

Revisiting the `pow.c` program in Figs. 6c and 6d, `mix` is specialized to a C interpreter to produce a C compiler (i.e., $[\![\texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}, \texttt{interpreter}^{\texttt{C}}_{\texttt{x86}}] = [\texttt{compiler}^{\texttt{C}\rightarrow\texttt{x86}}_{\texttt{x86}}]$). When given `pow` in C, this specialized `mix` program then specializes the interpreter to `pow`, producing an equivalent power program in



(a) The Second Futamura Projection.


$mix_{\mathcal{T}}$
($program_{\mathcal{T}}$, $partial\ input_{static}$)
$compiler_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{T}}$
$interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}$ ($program_{\mathcal{S}}$, $input$)
$program_{\mathcal{S}}$ (p_1 , p_2 , ..., p_n)
$interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}$ ($program_{\mathcal{S}}$, $input$)
$program_{\mathcal{T}}$
$program_{\mathcal{S}}$ (p_1 , p_2 , ..., p_n)

(b) The output of the Second Futamura Projection.



(c) An instance of the Second Futamura Projection.


$\texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}$
($\texttt{program}_{\texttt{x86}}$, partial $\texttt{input}_{\texttt{static}}$)
$\texttt{compiler}_{\texttt{x86}}^{\texttt{C}\to\texttt{x86}}$
$\texttt{interpreter}_{\texttt{x86}}^{\texttt{C}}$ ($\texttt{program}_{\texttt{C}}$, input)
pow.c (b , e)
$\texttt{interpreter}_{\texttt{x86}}^{\texttt{C}}$ ($\texttt{program}_{\texttt{C}}$, input)
$\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}$
pow.c (b , e)

(d) The output of the Second Futamura Projection instance.

Figure 6: The Second Futamura Projection and example instance.



(a) The Third Futamura Projection.



(b) The output of the Third Futamura Projection.

Figure 7: The Third Futamura Projection and output.

x86 ($[\![\texttt{compiler}_{\texttt{x86}}^{\texttt{C}\to\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{pow.c}] = [\texttt{pow}_{\texttt{x86}}]$).

> **Second Futamura Projection**: A partial evaluator, by making use of itself and the interpreter, can generate a compiler from the interpreted language to the implementation language of `mix`.

3.3 Third Futamura Projection: Generation of Compiler Generators

Because `mix` can accept itself as input, we can use one instance of `mix` to partially evaluate a second instance of `mix`, passing a third instance of `mix` as the static input. This is the *Third Futamura Projection*, shown in Fig. 7a and written equationally as $[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][mix_{\mathcal{T}}, mix_{\mathcal{T}}] = [compiler\ generator_{\mathcal{T}}]$. The transformation itself is straightforward: partially evaluating a program with some input. The output is still the program in the first input slot specialized to the data in the second input slot; however, this time both the program and the data are instances of `mix`. Again, the positioning of the various instances of `mix` within the diagram serves to clarify how the instances interact. The outermost instance executes with the other two instances as input. The middle instance is the program


mix_x86 (program_x86 partial input_static)
mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
compiler generator_x86
mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)

(a) An instance of the Third Futamura Projection.


mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
compiler generator_x86
mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
interpreter^C_x86 (program_C , input)
mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
compiler^{C→x86}_x86 interpreter^C_x86 (program_C , input)

(b) The output of the Third Futamura Projection instance.


mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
compiler generator_x86
mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
interpreter^Perl_x86 (program_Perl , input)
mix_x86 (program_x86 , partial input_static)
compiler^{Perl→x86}_x86 interpreter^Perl_x86 (program_Perl , input)

(c) The compiler generator generating a Perl compiler.

Figure 8: Instance of the Third Futamura Projection and output demonstration.

input of the outer instance and is specialized to the inner instance. Finally, the inner instance is being integrated into the middle instance by the outer instance. *Notice that Fig. 7b shows that the execution of the resulting program matches the shape and behavior of the Second Futamura Projection shown in Fig. 6a when provided with an interpreter as input.* The partial evaluator has generated the `mix`-based compiler generator from the second projection. This process is represented equationally as $[\![\mathit{compiler\ generator}_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][\mathit{interpreter}^{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}}] = [\mathit{compiler}^{\mathcal{S}\rightarrow\mathcal{T}}_{\mathcal{T}}]$.

Interestingly, the only variable part of the Third Futamura Projection is the language associated with `mix`. Previous instance diagrams were specific to the `pow.c` program; for instance, Fig. 6c presents an interpreter for the implementation language of `pow.c`, namely C. However, the diagram in Fig. 8a and the expression $[\![\texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}, \texttt{mix}_{\texttt{x86}}] = [\texttt{compiler generator}_{\texttt{x86}}]$ make no reference to `pow.c` or C. This is because the Third Futamura Projection has abstracted the interpretation process to an extent that the interpreter is considered dynamic input. Fig. 8b shows the `mix`-generated compiler generator accepting a C interpreter and generating a C to `x86` compiler ($[\![\texttt{compiler generator}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{interpreter}^{\texttt{C}}_{\texttt{x86}}] = [\texttt{compiler}^{\texttt{C}\rightarrow\texttt{x86}}_{\texttt{x86}}]$), but it will accept *any* interpreter implemented in `x86` regardless of the language interpreted. For example, Fig. 8c shows a compiler for the language Perl being generated by the same compiler generator (i.e., $[\![\texttt{compiler generator}_{\texttt{x86}}]\!][\texttt{interpreter}^{\texttt{Perl}}_{\texttt{x86}}] = [\texttt{compiler}^{\texttt{Perl}\rightarrow\texttt{x86}}_{\texttt{x86}}]$).

> **Third Futamura Projection**: A partial evaluator, by making use of two other instances of itself, can generate a compiler generator that produces compilers from any language to the implementation language of `mix`.

3.4 Summary: Futamura Projections

The Third Futamura Projection follows the pattern of the previous two projections: the use of `mix` to partially evaluate a prior process (i.e., interpretation, compilation). The first projection compiles by partially evaluating the interpretation process without the input of the source program. The second projection generates a compiler by partially evaluating the compilation process from the first projection without the source program. The Third Futamura Projection generates a compiler generator by partially evaluating the compiler generation process without the interpreter. Each projection delays completion of the previous process by abstracting away the more variable of two inputs. Just as the first projection interprets a program with various, dynamically-given inputs and the second projection compiles various programs, the third projection generates compilers for various languages/interpreters. Table 2 juxtaposes the related equations and diagrams from both § 2 and § 3 in each row to make their relationships more explicit. Each row of Table 3 succinctly summarizes each projection by associating each side of its equational representation with the corresponding diagram from § 3.

Table 2: Juxtaposition of related equations and diagrams from § 2 and § 3.

Fig.	Equational Notation	Input Description	Output Description	Similar Fig.	Output Fig.
1a	$[\![program]\!][a_1, a_2, ..., a_n] = [output]$	A list of arguments to the program.	The result of the program's execution.	N/A	N/A
2a	$[\![compiler_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{T}}]\!][program_{\mathcal{S}}] = [program_{\mathcal{T}}]$	A program in language $\mathcal{S}$.	The input program in language $\mathcal{T}$.	N/A	2c
3a	$[\![interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}]\!][program_{\mathcal{S}}, input] = [output]$	A program in language $\mathcal{S}$, along with its input.	The result of the program's execution.	N/A	N/A
4a	$[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][program_{\mathcal{T}}, partial\ input_{static}] = [program'_{\mathcal{T}}]$	A program in language $\mathcal{T}$, along with any subset of its input.	The input program specialized to the partial input.	N/A	4b
4b	$[\![program'_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][a_1, a_3, ..., a_n] = [output]$	A list of arguments to the original program, excluding the static input.	The result of the original program's execution.	1a	N/A
5a	$[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}, program_{\mathcal{S}}] = [program_{\mathcal{T}}]$	An interpreter for language $\mathcal{S}$ and a program implemented in $\mathcal{S}$.	The program implemented in $\mathcal{T}$.	N/A	5c
5c	$[\![program_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][a_1, a_2, ..., a_n] = [output]$	A list of arguments to the original program.	The result of the original program's execution.	3a	N/A
6a	$[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][mix_{\mathcal{T}}, interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}] = [compiler_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{T}}]$	*mix* and an interpreter for language $\mathcal{S}$, both implemented in $\mathcal{T}$.	A compiler from $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{T}$	N/A	6b
6b	$[\![compiler_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{T}}]\!][program_{\mathcal{S}}] = [program_{\mathcal{T}}]$	A program in language $\mathcal{S}$.	The input program in language $\mathcal{T}$.	5a	5c
7a	$[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][mix_{\mathcal{T}}, mix_{\mathcal{T}}] = [compiler\ generator_{\mathcal{T}}]$	Two instances of *mix* implemented in $\mathcal{T}$.	A compiler generator implemented in $\mathcal{T}$	N/A	7b
7b	$[\![compiler\ generator_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}] = [compiler_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{T}}]$	An interpreter for language $\mathcal{S}$.	A compiler from $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{T}$.	6a	6b

Table 3: Summary of Futamura Projections.

Projection	Description	Equational Notation	Fig.	Output Fig.
1	`mix` can compile.	$[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}, program_{\mathcal{S}}] = [program_{\mathcal{T}}]$	5a	5c
2	`mix` can generate a compiler.	$[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][mix_{\mathcal{T}}, interpreter_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}}] = [compiler_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{T}}]$	6a	6b
3	`mix` can generate a compiler generator.	$[\![mix_{\mathcal{T}}]\!][mix_{\mathcal{T}}, mix_{\mathcal{T}}] = [compiler\ generator_{\mathcal{T}}]$	7a	7b

3.5 Conclusion

Partial evaluation, through the Futamura Projections, can be used to compile, generate compilers, and generate compiler generators. Although the scope of the Futamura Projections has been largely limited to the programming languages research community, we are optimistic that this article has demystified their esoteric nature and shed light on their role in building powerful programming abstractions.

References

[Fut71] Y. Futamura. Partial evaluation of computation process: An approach to a compiler-compiler. *Systems Computers Controls*, 2(5):54–50, 1971.

[Fut99] Y. Futamura. Partial evaluation of computation process: An approach to a compiler-compiler. *Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation*, 12(4):381–391, 1999.

[FW08] D.P. Friedman and M. Wand. *Essentials of Programming Languages*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, third edition, 2008.

[Jon96] N.D. Jones. An introduction to partial evaluation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 28(3):480–503, 1996.